

**Remarks**

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in view of the above amendments and in light of the following remarks and discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-28 are currently pending in the application; Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 11, 12, 14, 15, and 16 having been amended, and new dependent Claims 21-28 having been added, by way of the present response. Applicants respectfully assert that support for the changes to the claims is self-evident from the originally filed disclosure, including the original claims, and that therefore no new matter has been added.

In the Office Action Claims 1-8 and 11-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 1,987,050 to Burnelli; and Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,457,479 to Daude. Applicants respectfully assert that the rejections of the claims have been overcome for the following reasons.

The present invention is directed to aerodynamic components. Independent Claim 1 recites a main body configured to be connected to a wing of an aircraft. A control member is connected to the main body. The control member includes a fixed member secured to the main body and a pivotable member configured to increase a drag of the aircraft without substantially changing a lift of the aircraft. The pivotable member is connected to the fixed member through a hinge member. The pivotable member and the fixed member extend from the hinge member in a same direction. Independent Claim 11 recites means for increasing a drag of an aircraft without substantially changing a lift of the aircraft. The means includes a pivotable member configured to pivot on a hinge member relative to a fixed member. The pivotable member and the fixed member extend from the hinge member in a same direction. The means is connected to the main body, which is configured to be connected to the wing of the aircraft.

Burnelli is directed to a tailless airplane. As shown in Figure 3, for example, of Burnelli, a vertical rudder 14 for lateral control is mounted on a vertical stabilizer 13 by an undescribed pivot.<sup>1</sup>

Applicants respectfully assert that Burnelli does not teach or render obvious, however, the claimed features of a pivotable member and a fixed member extending from a hinge member in a same direction, as recited in independent Claims 1 and 11. Rather, Applicants respectfully assert that Burnelli at most show the vertical rudder 14 and the vertical stabilizer 13 extending from the pivot in opposite directions. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that Burnelli cannot provide the advantages of a compact control member in which the pivotable and fixed members can be disposed along side one another, as can be provided by the claimed features recited in independent Claims 1 and 11.

Specifically, independent Claim 1 recites “the pivotable member and the fixed member extending from the hinge member in a same direction,” and independent Claim 11 recites “the pivotable member and the fixed member extending from the hinge member in a same direction.” Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of independent Claims 1 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) in view of Burnelli be withdrawn.

Daude is directed to winglets for aircraft wing tips. As shown in the Figures 2 and 3, for example, of Daude, a winglet 1 is mounted to a tip 2 of an aircraft wing so as to be rotatable about a substantially vertical axis extending through fixed points A and B.<sup>2</sup>

Applicants respectfully assert that Daude does not teach or render obvious, however, the claimed features of a pivotable member and a fixed member extending from a hinge member in a same direction, as recited in independent Claims 1 and 11. Rather, Applicants respectfully assert that Daude at most show the winglet 1 and the tip 2 extending from the fixed points A and B in opposite directions. Thus, as discussed above with respect to

---

<sup>1</sup> Column 2, lines 37-40, of Burnelli.

<sup>2</sup> Column 3, lines 28-40, of Daude.

Burnelli, Applicants respectfully assert that Daude also cannot provide the advantages provided by the claimed invention of a compact control member in which the pivotable and fixed members can be disposed along side one another. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of independent Claims 1 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) in view of Daude be withdrawn.

Applicants respectfully assert that the grounds of rejection of independent Claims 1 and 11 have been overcome for the foregoing reasons. Thus, Applicants respectfully request the allowance of independent Claims 1 and 11.

Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 2-10 and 12-28 are allowable for the same reasons as the independent claims from which they depend, as well as for their own features. Thus, Applicants respectfully request the allowance of dependent Claims 2-10 and 12-28.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment, no further issues are believed to be outstanding in the present application, and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal Allowance. A Notice of Allowance for Claims 1-28 is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner deem that any further action is necessary to place this application in even better form for allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

Customer Number

**22850**


Tel: (703) 413-3000

Fax: (703) 413 -2220

(OSMMN 06/04)

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Philippe J.C. Signore, Ph.D.

Registration No. 43,922

Attorney of Record

Philip J. Hoffmann

Registration No. 46,340

PJCS/PH/me

I:\ATTY\PH\245127\PRP AM 01.14.05.DOC